

RESOLUTION TO REVISE FACULTY HANDBOOK PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

WHEREAS, chapter three of the university's Faculty Handbook -- Employment Policies and Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty -- has not been thoroughly revised in many years; and

WHEREAS, based upon the shared belief of the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost that a thorough revision was warranted, a Commission on Faculty Affairs working group was formed for this purpose in the fall of 2016; and

WHEREAS, the working group sought to simplify and standardize procedures, clarify and update requirements, and ensure the equitable treatment of faculty while maintaining Virginia Tech's high academic standards; and

WHEREAS, the Commission on Faculty Affairs has periodically presented the revision to the Faculty Senate, department heads/chairs, and deans and incorporated many of the suggestions these groups have offered; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost believe that the revision, which includes changes to the guidelines for processing promotion and/or tenure cases and the standards by which cases are evaluated, improves upon the guidelines and traditions that have served Virginia Tech well for many years; and

WHEREAS, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will work with faculty and administrators to facilitate the transition between the current and new guidelines;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Handbook promotion and tenure guidelines will be revised according to the full text included in Appendix 2; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that these revised guidelines will become effective beginning with faculty considered for promotion and/or tenure during the 2022-2023 academic year.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board of Visitors approve this resolution for inclusion in the university's 2021 – 2022 Faculty Handbook.

March 22, 2021

Appendix 1: Summary of major changes in Chapter 3 revision

1) Added the following language about limitations on the overall process and review of procedural concerns raised by faculty serving on P & T committees (3.4):

Once a promotion and/or tenure case has been submitted, it must proceed through the processes outlined in this chapter unless the candidate chooses to withdraw his or her case. This is true even if a candidate has accepted a position at another institution: under these circumstances, the case proceeds normally, up to and including the president's recommendation, but will not be taken to the Board of Visitors.

To ensure the honest discussion of promotion and/or tenure cases, all parties involved must keep the deliberations strictly confidential to the extent permitted by law. As such, the content of conversations and the results of any votes may be discussed only with persons who have a current role in the promotion and tenure process, such as committee members or administrators. However, faculty serving on promotion and tenure committees who believe that Faculty Handbook procedures are not being followed may bring their concerns to the Faculty Review Committee for confidential review as outlined in chapter one, "Faculty Review Committee."

2) Added description of P & T documents required for each department (3.4):

Each department will maintain promotion and/or tenure guidelines in a single document that follows the university template and includes all information regarding departmental procedures and expectations for reappointment, progress toward promotion and/or tenure, and the evaluation of promotion and/or tenure cases. Nothing in these guidelines shall supersede or contradict the provisions of the Faculty Handbook. If a college elects to adopt guidelines that establish a college-wide standard for promotion and/or tenure, with the dean's approval, departments may maintain a set of guidelines that interpret the college-wide standard within the context of the department's disciplines and traditions. All guidelines will be approved by faculty (through department- and/or college-level governance), the college-level committee and the dean, and the provost's office, and will be made available on-line. Revisions to these guidelines must also be approved by the faculty, the college, and the provost's office. In addition to tenure-track faculty, guidelines will cover the promotion of all non-tenure-track faculty.

Deleted: Promotion Guidelines

Deleted: documents

3) Revised the basic criteria for promotion and/or tenure and added the use of "Expectations and Indicators For Promotion and/or Tenure." Changed the categories (Instruction, Research, etc), and most of the language used to describe them, to agree with the Provost's guidelines (3.4.4):

Current: Each candidate for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor is evaluated in the light of the triple mission of the university: learning, discovery, and engagement. Although not all candidates are expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in each of these missions, a high level of general competence is expected in recognition of the need for flexibility in the future establishment of priorities in academic programs. Beyond that basic foundation of competence, decisions related to tenure or promotion to associate professor require evidence of excellence in at least one area.

The award of tenure is based on the achievement of distinction in an area of learning and the prediction of eminence throughout the individual's professional career. The documentation and evaluation should recognize some significant impact of the candidate's contributions beyond the borders of the university. If the primary strength is in instruction, there should be recognition that the candidate's pedagogical contributions have influence beyond the immediate classroom; if in

research, that there is significant impression on colleagues nationally; if in outreach that the influence of the contributions reaches beyond the immediate clientele.

Proposed: In accordance with their assignments and as outlined in the “Virginia Tech Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers” document available from the provost’s office, candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in the following categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. While candidates are not expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in all of these areas, scholarship is expected of all tenure-track faculty to a degree and in a discipline appropriate for their assignment.

Teaching (*Includes advising/mentoring*): Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes formal and informal advising/mentoring. In any assessment of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, both the quality and the quantity of the individual’s achievements in teaching and advising/mentoring should be considered. Those evaluating candidates for promotion and/or tenure should give special consideration to teaching effectiveness: faculty must demonstrate the ability to evaluate scholarship applicable to their field and effectively teach their discipline to students.

Scholarship (*Includes research, creative activities, and extension activities*): Scholarship, broadly defined at Virginia Tech as the discovery, transmission, and/or application of knowledge, takes many forms, including but not limited to research, creative activity, and extension activity. While both the quality and quantity of a candidate’s achievements should be examined, quality should be the primary consideration. Quality should be defined largely in terms of the work’s importance in the progress or redefinition of a field or discipline, the establishment of relationships among disciplines, the improvement of practitioner performance, or the creativity of the thought and methods behind it. To be awarded tenure, in addition to demonstrating productivity as a scholar, a candidate must provide evidence that their scholarship has growing impact nationally or internationally and the potential for greater impact in the future. Promotion to the rank of professor requires evidence of ongoing or renewed productivity and the realization of a candidate’s potential for greater impact nationally or internationally, including a description of how their scholarship has influenced their field.

Deleted: that a candidate’s scholarship has had sustained

Service (*Includes engagement, university service, professional service, medical service, inclusion and diversity, and additional outreach and extension activities*): In the spirit of Ut Prosim (That I may serve) and the land-grant mission, faculty are expected to use their knowledge, creativity, and expertise to improve the human condition and engage the communities of which they are a part. Candidates must demonstrate their contributions to the governance, development, and vitality of the university, their academic professions, and other relevant communities at the local, state, national, and/or international level. The quality and effectiveness of healthcare delivery and outreach and extension activities that are not considered scholarship should also be documented.

Deleted: will

Deleted: engage and

Deleted: Faculty have significant roles in

Deleted: and

Deleted: must demonstrate their service to the university and relevant professional organizations

Deleted: Faculty should also seek ways in which to use their scholarship to enhance international and global understanding as well as to advance their professional disciplines.

Deleted: international activities,

Deleted: ,

Deleted: take into account

Deleted: Promotion Guidelines

Evaluators must consider the unique features of every candidate’s department, discipline, and assignment. Therefore, as part of their promotion and/or tenure guidelines (see Chapter 3, “Promotion and Tenure”), each department (or college, when college-wide guidelines are applied) is required to have an “Expectations and Indicators for Promotion and/or Tenure” section that accounts for disciplinary and programmatic differences unique to and within the department(s) and

specifies what is required of their faculty members to fulfill the general expectations outlined above. Departments or colleges should carefully assess and state the overall standards of professional performance and contribution they consider minimally acceptable for the conferral of promotion and/or tenure. These expectations must be adhered to by evaluators at every stage of the promotion and/or tenure process. Colleges that adopt a college-wide set of promotion and/or tenure guidelines will ensure that the “Expectations and Indicators for Promotion and/or Tenure” section accounts for differences within and across departments and schools.

Deleted: distinctions are best clarified at the department level and

Deleted: In colleges

Deleted: Promotion Guidelines,

Deleted: will

Since expectations can change, tenure candidates will be evaluated according to the expectations and indicators in effect at the time of their appointment. Candidates for promotion to professor will be evaluated according to the expectations and indicators in place at the time of their application for promotion.

3) Heads/chairs no longer have the option to serve on department committees (3.4.4.1).

4) For mandatory cases, full college review (both dean and college committee) of no/no decisions at the department level will be automatic (3.4.4.2).

5) Members of college and university committees must be given a period of time to discuss the cases w/o deans or the provost in attendance (3.4.4.2 & 3.4.4.3).

6) The guidelines covered in a document titled “Promotion and/or Tenure Procedures for University Committee Deliberations and Notifications” are not in the Faculty Handbook. We included a stripped-down version of those guidelines and made clear that the handbook provides the guidelines for the Univ. P & T Committee procedures, not the other way around (3.4.4.3).

7) Clarified that the University Promotion and Tenure Committee only votes once by removing the use of terms such as “straw votes” or “straw ballots” in favor of the following (3.4.4.3):

The committee then rates the cases to clarify which cases need more discussion.

8) Added a candidate notification sub-section. Candidates are notified of the decision at each level of the process (3.4.4.4):

As a promotion and/or tenure case proceeds, the candidate must be notified in writing of the recommendations made by each committee and administrator.

Any negative recommendations, whether by a committee or administrator, must include all substantive reasons for that recommendation, including references to the “Expectations and Indicators” section of the relevant promotion and/or tenure guidelines, as well as options for appeal. While notification letters may include excerpts from committee or administrator letters, they cannot include the results of any votes, the names of external evaluators, or statements from their evaluations.

9) Revised the grounds for appeal and clarified the relationship between an appeal and a grievance (3.4.5):

Current: The appeal can only be based on grounds that certain relevant information was not provided or considered in the decision, or that the decision was influenced by improper consideration.

Proposed: An appeal can be based on the following claims only: department criteria established in the “Expectations and Indicators” section of the relevant department’s promotion and/or tenure guidelines were not appropriately applied; material from the dossier was unavailable to or

disregarded by reviewers through no fault of the candidate; or information in the dossier was not considered in a fair and objective manner.

Additionally, faculty have the option to grieve procedural violations of the promotion and tenure process—including violations of the appeal process presented in this section—after a negative decision on an appeal or instead of filing an appeal in the first place. Since the grievance procedures allow the grievant to state both the grievance they believe they have experienced and the relief they seek, it has a wider range of possible outcomes than the appeal process. However, because it is a slower process that may not be completed until the promotion and/or tenure cases in a given year have been decided, and because faculty cannot grieve “items falling within the jurisdiction of other university policies and procedures,” a grievance should be thought of as a means for faculty to seek an outcome they cannot seek through the appeal process. The grievance process is described in chapter three, “Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures.”

10) Expanded which cases can be appealed and simplified the appeal process (3.4.5.2):

Current: Occasionally faculty members are evaluated for a tenured appointment during the probationary period but before the final probationary year. In such a case, there is no recourse to appeal or review of a negative decision, at whatever level it is reached, because of the certainty that the evaluation will be undertaken again within a limited time.

Evaluation for a tenured appointment is mandatory in the sixth year of probationary service unless the faculty member has given written notice of resignation from the faculty. If both the departmental committee and the department head or chair agree that the faculty member’s record does not warrant a tenured appointment, there is an automatic review of the candidate’s dossier by the dean. If the dean concurs, the faculty member is notified by the dean, in writing, of the decision and the specific reasons for it. The faculty member may then request, through the dean, that the college committee on promotion and tenure independently review the decision. The faculty member presents the appeal in writing as specified in chapter three “Appeals of Decisions on Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion.” The faculty member may elect to present oral arguments to the committee as well. If the committee concurs with the decision, the decision is final. The dean so notifies the faculty member, in writing, and no further appeal is provided.

During the automatic review of the candidate’s dossier, the dean may wish to reserve judgment. In such a case, the dean notifies the faculty member of the departmental decision and tells the faculty member that he or she is requesting the college committee on promotion and tenure to undertake an independent review, as specified in the previous paragraph, and to make a recommendation. Should the college committee and the dean concur with the departmental decision, the decision is declared final, the faculty member is so notified, and no further appeal is provided. The specific reason for the decision is provided to the faculty member in writing.

In any case of college-level review of a negative departmental decision, a positive recommendation by either the college committee or the dean is sent with the dossier to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee in the same way as in the usual review process.

If the college committee and the dean undertake the review based on a positive recommendation of either or both the departmental committee and the department head or chair and if the college committee recommends that tenure not be awarded and the dean concurs, the faculty member is notified of the negative decision with reference to appeal procedures. The specific reasons for the decision are furnished to the faculty member in writing. The faculty member may then appeal to the provost for review of the decision by the university committee, which makes a recommendation to

the provost for a final decision. The faculty member presents the appeal in writing as specified in chapter three, "Appeals of Decisions on Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion." No further appeal is provided. The university committee may choose to hear oral arguments.

Should the provost not concur with a positive recommendation from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, whether that recommendation culminates a usual review or an appeal, the faculty member is so notified in writing of the specific reason for the decision. The faculty member may appeal to the [Faculty Review Committee](#). That committee investigates the case and, if the differences cannot be reconciled, makes a recommendation to the president on the matter. The president's decision is final.

During review following an appeal, the college committee may find reason to believe that the departmental evaluation was biased or was significantly influenced by improper considerations. In that case, the reviewing committee may request that the college dean form an ad hoc committee to re-initiate the evaluation. The ad hoc committee is composed, as feasible, of faculty members in the candidate's department or in closely allied fields and does not contain any members of the original committee.

Should the university committee make such a finding in the review of an appeal relative to the college evaluation, it requests the dean to form a new ad hoc committee at the college level. The ad hoc committee makes a recommendation to the committee that requested its formation.

Proposed: Appeal of negative department or college decisions: Because all mandatory tenure cases, even those given a negative recommendation by the department committee and the head or chair, receive a full college level review, there is no appeal of a negative tenure decision at the department level.

With all non-mandatory cases, whether promotion and/or tenure, if the committee and the relevant administrator both make negative recommendations, the candidate may appeal that negative decision to the next level in the process. The faculty member has the right to appear before the committee considering the appeal and present arguments.

If either the college committee or the dean grants the appeal of a negative department decision, the case resumes normal consideration, beginning with the college committee and dean. If either the University Promotion and Tenure Committee or the provost grants the appeal of a negative college decision, the case resumes normal consideration, beginning with the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and the provost. At either the college or university level, if the committee and the relevant administrator both make negative recommendations, the appeal is denied and no further appeal is provided.

Appeal of negative university decisions: Because all recommendations from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and the provost are forwarded to the president, candidates may appeal negative recommendations of either or both to the Faculty Review Committee. The faculty member has the right to appear before the committee to present arguments. The Faculty Review Committee investigates the case and makes a recommendation to the president.

The president's recommendation to the Board of Visitors, and the Board of Visitors' final decision, cannot be appealed.

11) Added a table of appeal options (3.4.5.2)

Appendix 2: Full text of Chapter 3 revision

3.4 Promotion and Tenure

Promotion in rank and the granting of tenure are based on a faculty member's contributions to the university in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Decisions about promotion and/or tenure are guided by the Virginia Tech Principles of Community (see chapter two, "Virginia Tech Principles of Community").

The university has a tradition of upholding academic freedom. It endorses the "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges (AAUP Bulletin, September 1970, pp. 323-326).

Faculty members being considered for promotion and/or tenure have their dossiers reviewed at as many as three levels: by a department committee and the head or chair, by a college committee and the dean, and by a university committee and the provost.

Once a promotion and/or tenure case has been submitted, it must proceed through the processes outlined in this chapter unless the candidate chooses to withdraw their case. This is true even if a candidate has accepted a position at another institution: under these circumstances, the case proceeds normally, up to and including the president's recommendation, but will not be taken to the Board of Visitors.

To ensure the honest discussion of promotion and/or tenure cases, all parties involved must keep the deliberations strictly confidential to the extent permitted by law. As such, the content of conversations and the results of any votes may be discussed only with persons who have a current role in the promotion and tenure process, such as committee members or administrators. However, faculty serving on promotion and tenure committees who believe that Faculty Handbook procedures are not being followed may bring their concerns to the Faculty Review Committee for confidential review as outlined in chapter one, "Faculty Review Committee."

Although some participants in the review process may serve at more than one level—for example, a departmental committee member may also serve on the college committee—participants may vote only once on a case and must vote at their first opportunity to do so. A faculty member may not serve on any committee that is evaluating a spouse, family member, or other individual with whom they have a close personal relationship. (See chapter two, "Conflicts of Interest.")

Each department will maintain promotion and/or tenure guidelines in a single document that follows the university template and includes all information regarding departmental procedures and expectations for reappointment, progress toward promotion and/or tenure, and the evaluation of promotion and/or tenure cases. Nothing in these guidelines shall supersede or contradict the provisions of the Faculty Handbook. If a college elects to adopt guidelines that establish a college-wide standard for promotion and/or tenure, with the dean's approval, departments may maintain a set of guidelines that interpret the college-wide standard within the context of the department's disciplines and traditions. All guidelines will be approved by faculty (through department- and or college-level governance), the college-level committee and the dean, and the provost's office, and will

Deleted: Promotion

be made available online. Revisions to these guidelines must also be approved by the faculty, the college, and the provost's office. In addition to tenure-track faculty, guidelines will cover the promotion of all non-tenure-track faculty.

Deleted: documents

A note on the Promotion and Tenure section of the Faculty Handbook: Throughout this section, it should be understood that departmental procedures, expectations, and standards also apply to schools. For example, the procedures for department-level committees are also the procedures for school-level committees.

3.4.1 Tenure Eligibility (unchanged)

Tenure is an institution developed to protect the academic freedom of the teaching faculty in institutions of higher education. Eligibility for tenure consideration is limited to faculty members holding regular faculty appointments of 50 percent to 100 percent in academic departments. Tenure is not granted to faculty members with temporary appointments or to administrative and professional faculty. Individuals who hold tenure in academic departments and are also appointed to administrative positions, however, continue to hold tenure in those departments.

Full-time administrators who also hold appointments in academic departments and engage in teaching and research may be recommended for tenure in such departments.

3.4.2 Pre-tenure Probationary Period and Reviews of Progress Toward Promotion and/or Tenure

Pre-tenure probationary period: The term "probationary period" ("pre-tenure") is applied to the succession of term appointments that an individual undertakes on a full- or part-time regular faculty appointment, and during which continued evaluation for reappointment and for an eventual tenured appointment takes place. The probationary period for faculty members on term appointments begins on either July 1 or August 10 of the calendar year in which their initial full-time appointment begins, depending on whether they are on a calendar year or academic year appointment, regardless of the month in which their services are initiated. (The probationary period for new faculty appointed for spring semester begins the following fall even though the spring contract period officially begins December 25.)

The initial appointment for assistant professors, associate professors, and professors employed without tenure is ordinarily a period of no less than two years. Multiple-year reappointment may be subsequently recommended.

The maximum total period for full-time probationary appointments is six years, unless an approved extension is granted. Decision about tenure, if not made earlier, is made in the sixth year (mandatory year) of the probationary appointment. If the tenure decision made in the sixth year is negative, a one-year terminal appointment is offered.

Up to three years of appropriate service at other accredited four-year colleges and universities may be credited toward the six-year probationary period, as specified in chapter three, "Guidelines for the Calculation of Prior Service."

A faculty member on a probationary appointment who wishes to request a leave of absence should consult with their department head or chair about the effect of the leave on the probationary period, taking into account the professional development that the leave promises. The request for leave should address this matter. The provost's approval of the request specifies whether the leave is to be included in the probationary period.

Pre-tenure faculty members may request a term part-time appointment as described in chapter three, "Part-Time Tenure-Track and Tenured Appointments," for reasons of balancing work and family or personal health issues. In such cases, the probationary period is extended proportionately. For example, two years of service at 50 percent count as one year of full-time service. The term appointment may be renewed. (A permanent part-time appointment may be requested and granted following award of tenure.)

In determining the mandatory tenure review year for those with partial appointments, general equivalency to full-time appointments is expected, so that approximately five years of full-time equivalent service is expected prior to the mandatory tenure review year if no tenure clock extensions are granted, six years if one year of extension is granted, and seven years if two extensions are granted. (In summing partial years of service, a total resulting in a fraction equal to or less than 0.5 is rounded down, and a fraction greater than 0.5 is rounded up.) However, review for tenure must occur no later than the tenth year of service, resulting in somewhat less full-time equivalent service (4.5 years) for a faculty member with 50 percent appointment throughout all nine probationary years prior to review. If a faculty member is denied tenure following a mandatory review, a one-year terminal appointment is offered.

Faculty members on part-time appointments may request a tenure clock extension in accordance with chapter three, "Probationary Period Extensions (Extending the Tenure Clock)." (Extensions are granted in one-year increments, not prorated by the part-time appointment percentage.) However, the extension is not approved if it results in a mandatory review date beyond the tenth year.

Pre-tenure reviews: Under usual circumstances, departmental promotion and tenure committees review the professional progress and performance of pre-tenure faculty members two times during the probationary period, usually in their second and fourth or third and fifth years. The timing of the reviews depends upon the nature of the faculty member's discipline and must be clearly indicated in written department policies. The terms of offer identify the initial appointment period. Pre-tenure reviews may be delayed if there is an approved extension as described above. Changes or variations in the standard review cycle must be documented in writing.

Reviews are substantive and thorough. At minimum, departmental promotion and tenure committees must review the faculty member's relevant annual activity reports, peer evaluations of teaching, authored materials, or other artifacts of scholarship or creative activity. It is strongly suggested that promotion and tenure committees and pre-tenure faculty use the promotion and

Deleted: and

tenure dossier format (available on the provost's website) to organize and present information for review.

The pre-tenure reviews should analyze the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure and offer guidance regarding future activities and plans. All reviews must be in writing, with the faculty member acknowledging receipt by signing and returning a copy for their departmental file. In addition, the promotion and tenure committee chair and the department head or chair meet with the faculty member to discuss the review and recommendations. Faculty members are also encouraged to seek guidance and mentoring from senior colleagues and the department head or chair. Pre-tenure faculty members bear responsibility for understanding and meeting departmental expectations for promotion and/or tenure.

The initial review for a part-time faculty member should occur no later than the third year of service (regardless of percent of employment) to give early feedback on their progress. At least two reviews should be conducted for part-time faculty members during their probationary period; more are recommended. The anticipated schedule for such reviews for reappointment and for the mandatory review for tenure should be documented in writing as part of the agreement for the part-time appointment. Changes should be agreed upon and documented by the faculty member and department.

In the fall semester prior to applying for tenure in a non-mandatory year, a candidate must inform the head or chair of their intention to apply, thereby giving the department time to conduct an additional review of the candidate's progress, if such a review is deemed necessary. The extent of this review is determined by each department or school.

Review of progress toward promotion to professor: At least one review of progress toward promotion to professor should be conducted three to five years after promotion and tenure is awarded (or after tenure is awarded at the current rank of associate professor). The review—required for faculty promoted and tenured during 2012–13 and thereafter—is to be substantive and thorough. At minimum, an appropriate departmental committee (e.g., promotion and tenure committee, personnel committee, annual review committee) must review the faculty member's relevant annual activity reports, peer evaluations of teaching, and authored materials since promotion. The faculty member may wish to complete a draft promotion dossier (using the format available on the provost's website) to organize and present information for review.

The review should be developmental and recommend future activities and plans that will position the faculty member for promotion to professor. All reviews must be in writing, with the faculty member acknowledging receipt by signing and returning a copy for their departmental file. In addition, the faculty member may request a meeting with the promotion and tenure committee chair and the department head or chair to discuss the review and recommendations. Faculty members are also encouraged to seek guidance and mentoring from senior colleagues and the department head or chair.

There is no specification for minimum or maximum time of service in the rank of associate professor with tenure. Consideration for promotion to professor may be requested of the department head or

chair by a faculty member at any time. However, in the fall semester prior to applying for promotion to professor, a candidate must inform the head or chair of their intention to apply, thereby giving the department time to conduct a review of the candidate's progress, if such a review is deemed necessary. The extent of this review is determined by each department or school.

3.4.2.1 Probationary Period Extensions (Extending the Tenure Clock)

Upon application, a one-year probationary period extension is automatically granted to either parent (or both, if both parents are tenure-track faculty members) in recognition of the demands of caring for a newborn child or a child under five newly placed for adoption or foster care. An extension may also be approved on a discretionary basis for other extenuating non-professional circumstances that have a significant impact on the faculty member's productivity, such as a serious personal illness or major illness of an immediate family member. In rare cases, extraordinary professional circumstances not of the faculty member's making may be acceptable justification for an extension, for example exceptional delays in procuring critical equipment, laboratory renovations, or other elements of the committed start-up package essential to establishing a viable research program.

Faculty members who utilize this policy are expected to fulfill their usual responsibilities during the probationary period extension unless they are also granted a period of modified duties or unless other arrangements are made (see chapter three, "Modified Duties").

Probationary period extensions are granted in one-year increments. A cumulative total of two years is usually the maximum probationary period extension for any combination of reasons. Requests should be made within a year of the qualifying event (such as the arrival of a child in the family) or extenuating circumstance (such as an illness). The provost may approve exceptions to these limitations.

Requests for a probationary period extension are submitted in writing to the department head or chair. (A form is available on the [provost's website](#).) Documentation of medical reasons (other than childbirth or adoption) is required prior to approval, and documentation of other extenuating circumstances may also be required. Approvals by the department head or chair, dean, and provost are required for probationary period extensions. The faculty member may appeal denial of the request to the next higher level in their organizational reporting structure.

Regardless of when a candidate granted a probationary term extension applies for tenure—prior to their original mandatory year, in their original mandatory year, or in their extension year—it is very important that all individuals and committees participating in tenure reviews understand that the candidate must be held to the same standard, not a higher or more stringent one, as candidates without such an extension.

A probationary extension usually extends the time frame for each subsequent review and reappointment during the probationary period. For example, an extension granted prior to the fourth year review and reappointment typically delays that review by one year.

3.4.3 Guidelines for the Calculation of Prior Service

At the time of the initial appointment, the department head or chair notifies the new faculty member of their standing regarding the tenure system, including when the appointment will be considered for renewal and the length of the probationary period until mandatory consideration for tenure must be given.

Credit for prior service toward the probationary period may be granted for appropriate service in another accredited four-year college or university but only if the faculty member requests such credit. In such a request, the faculty member presents all prior service undertaken after the completion of the terminal degree appropriate to the field. A maximum of three years may be credited toward probationary service at Virginia Tech. The request must be made in writing within one year of the initial appointment. The specification of credit for prior service toward the probationary period is subject to the approval of the provost on the recommendation of the department head or chair and the dean.

3.4.4 General Expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure

In accordance with their assignments and as outlined in the “Virginia Tech Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossier” document available from the provost’s office, candidates for promotion and/or tenure will be evaluated in the following categories: teaching, scholarship, and service. While candidates are not expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in all of these areas, scholarship is expected of all tenure-track faculty to a degree and in a discipline appropriate for their assignment.

Teaching (*Includes advising/mentoring*): Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes formal and informal advising/mentoring. In any assessment of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, both the quality and the quantity of the individual’s achievements in teaching and advising/mentoring should be considered. Those evaluating candidates for promotion and/or tenure should give special consideration to teaching effectiveness: faculty must demonstrate the ability to evaluate scholarship applicable to their field and effectively teach their discipline to students.

Scholarship (*Includes research, creative activities, and extension activities*): Scholarship, broadly defined at Virginia Tech as the discovery, transmission, and/or application of knowledge, takes many forms, including but not limited to research, creative activity, and extension activity. While both the quality and quantity of a candidate’s achievements should be examined, quality should be the primary consideration. Quality should be defined largely in terms of the work’s importance in the progress or redefinition of a field or discipline, the establishment of relationships among disciplines, the improvement of practitioner performance, or the creativity of the thought and methods behind it. To be awarded tenure, in addition to demonstrating productivity as a scholar, a candidate must provide evidence that their scholarship has growing impact nationally or internationally and the potential for greater impact in the future. Promotion to the rank of professor requires evidence of ongoing or renewed productivity and the realization of a candidate’s potential for greater impact nationally or internationally, including a description of how their scholarship has influenced their field.

Deleted: that a candidate’s scholarship has had sustained

Service (Includes engagement, university service, professional service, medical service, inclusion and diversity, and additional outreach and extension activities): In the spirit of Ut Prosim (That I may serve) and the land-grant mission, faculty are expected to use their knowledge, creativity, and expertise to improve the human condition and engage the communities of which they are a part. Candidates must demonstrate their contributions to the governance, development, and vitality of the university, their academic professions, and other relevant communities at the local, state, national, and/or international level. The quality and effectiveness of healthcare delivery and outreach and extension activities that are not considered scholarship should also be documented.

Evaluators must consider the unique features of every candidate's department, discipline, and assignment. Therefore, as part of their promotion and/or tenure guidelines (see Chapter 3, "Promotion and Tenure"), each department (or college, when college-wide guidelines are applied) is required to have an "Expectations and Indicators for Promotion and/or Tenure" section that accounts for disciplinary and programmatic differences unique to and within the department(s) and specifies what is required of their faculty members to fulfill the general expectations outlined above. Departments or colleges should carefully assess and state the overall standards of professional performance and contribution they consider minimally acceptable for the conferral of promotion and/or tenure. These expectations must be adhered to by evaluators at every stage of the promotion and/or tenure process. Colleges that adopt a college-wide set of promotion and/or tenure guidelines will ensure that the "Expectations and Indicators for Promotion and/or Tenure" section accounts for differences within and across departments and schools.

Since expectations can change, tenure candidates will be evaluated according to the expectations and indicators in effect at the time of their appointment. Candidates for promotion to professor will be evaluated according to the expectations and indicators in place at the time of their application for promotion.

Besides professional criteria, evaluation for promotion and/or tenure should include consideration of the candidate's integrity, professional conduct, and ethics. To the extent that such considerations are factors in reaching a negative recommendation, they must be documented as part of the formal review process and included in the candidate's notification.

Every faculty member should maintain a current curriculum vitae, with copies filed in the department and college (or equivalent academic units, as appropriate). The candidate prepares a dossier that includes an executive summary; the candidate's statement; documentation of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and other activities relevant to the candidate's assignment; and a list of work under review or in progress. The dossier is completed by the inclusion of recommendation statements, both internal and external, which are added as the dossier is reviewed at the department and college levels. For faculty who present significant interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary teaching, research, outreach, or extension activities as part of their record, the dossier should include one evaluation letter from the director, coordinator, or leader of the interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary program.

The promotion and tenure guidelines and a standard dossier cover page are available on the provost's website. All candidate dossiers must be submitted to the University Promotion and Tenure

Deleted: will

Deleted: and improve

Deleted: Faculty have significant roles in

Deleted: and

Deleted: must demonstrate their service to the university and relevant professional organizations

Deleted: Faculty should also seek ways in which to use their scholarship to enhance international and global understanding as well as to advance their professional disciplines.

Deleted: international activities,

Deleted: ,

Deleted: take into account

Deleted: Promotion Guidelines

Deleted: distinctions are best clarified at the department level and

Deleted: In c

Deleted: Promotion Guidelines,

Deleted: will

Committee according to the guidelines on the provost's website. The department head or chair, or the department committee, are responsible for ensuring that the dossier conforms to these guidelines.

Candidates who apply for tenure prior to the mandatory year of application must be evaluated by the same standard—not a higher or more stringent one—as candidates who apply in their mandatory year. A candidate who applies for tenure prior to their mandatory year but receives a negative decision can apply again in their mandatory year.

The criteria by which faculty with part-time appointments are evaluated for tenure are the same as the criteria by which full-time faculty are evaluated. Promotion and tenure committees consider years of full-time equivalent service when reaching decisions, excluding any approved probationary period extensions granted under the extending the tenure clock policy.

3.4.4.1 Department Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure

Determination of Candidates: In their promotion and/or tenure guidelines, each department will have a process for determining which candidates are to be considered for promotion and/or tenure, including those faculty members in the sixth year of probationary service. Candidates should be identified in the fall semester one year prior to applying for promotion and/or tenure.

Department Committee Composition: Each department must have one or more committees with appropriate faculty representation to evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure, tenure at the currently held rank, and promotion to professor, and make recommendations to the department head or chair. While the process of selecting committees may vary between departments, significant elements of faculty choice, as determined through departmental governance, must be part of the selection process. Some possible methods for committee selection include a combination of elected and appointed representatives; an elected slate significantly larger than the committee size, allowing the department head or chair to appoint the committee from the slate; or a committee elected by the faculty. A minimum committee size of five members is most appropriate in order to achieve adequate representation and effectiveness of committee operations.

Department Committee Evaluation of Candidate: The committee chair or department head or chair furnishes the committee with a dossier for each candidate. After evaluating each candidate's dossier on the basis of criteria established in the "Expectations and Indicators" section of the department's promotion and/or tenure guidelines, the committee votes and writes a recommendation letter for each candidate, including the division of the vote. The committee's letter contains the evaluation of the candidate's performance in each relevant area and provides a recommendation for promotion and tenure, tenure at the currently held rank, or promotion to professor. In the absence of a unanimous recommendation by the committee, the division of the vote must be explained. A minority letter may be attached to the committee's recommendation letter. All letters must be sent to the head or chair and become part of the dossier.

Given their responsibility to make a separate and independent recommendation on each case, department heads or chairs (or school directors) may not serve as members of department committees: program directors or area chairs may. A department head or chair may convene the

committee, charge the committee with its responsibilities, and discuss the cases. However, subsequent to the discussions with the department head or chair, the committee must discuss the merits of the candidates, frame its recommendations, and take the final vote without the head or chair in attendance and without influence by the head or chair.

Department Head or Chair Evaluation of Candidate: The head or chair evaluates each candidate's dossier, including the committee's letter, on the basis of criteria established in the "Expectations and Indicators" section of the department's promotion and/or tenure guidelines and writes a recommendation letter for each candidate. The head's or chair's letter, which may draw from the committee's letter or letters, contains the evaluation of the candidate's performance in each relevant area and provides a recommendation for promotion and tenure, tenure at the currently held rank, or promotion to professor. The letter from the head or chair becomes part of the dossier and should follow the guidelines established by the provost, which are available on the provost's website. If the recommendation for promotion and/or tenure varies from the department committee's, reasons for that variance must be specified, including references to the department's "Expectations and Indicators." The department head or chair will share their letter with the department promotion and tenure committee as soon as it is available.

In cases of mandatory (final year of probationary service) tenure decisions, the head or chair sends the dossier of every candidate to the dean, even when both the head or chair and the committee have made negative recommendations. In all other cases, the head or chair sends the dossier of every candidate to the dean, except if the committee's recommendation is negative and the head or chair concurs. Under those circumstances, the head or chair declares a final decision and no further review is carried out.

The dossiers that the head or chair sends to the dean are accompanied by a statement describing the formation and procedures of the department committee and a summary of the number of candidates considered by the committee in each category (mandatory tenure, non-mandatory-year tenure, and promotion at each rank). The division of the department committee's vote must be added to the dossier, but otherwise remains confidential.

3.4.4.2 College Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure

College Committee Composition: Each college must have a committee with appropriate faculty representation to review the recommendations sent by department heads or chairs. While the process of selecting committees may vary between colleges, rules governing eligibility and selection of college committee members and the committee chair, as well as operating guidelines for the committee's deliberations, must be documented and formally approved by the faculty. Significant elements of faculty choice must be part of the selection process. Some possible methods for committee selection include election by the college faculty; appointment by an elected college executive committee; a combination of elected and appointed (by the dean or college executive committee) representatives; or an elected slate significantly larger than the required committee size, thus allowing the dean or college executive committee to appoint the committee from the elected slate. Selection of the committee chair is determined in accordance with college policies,

approved by the faculty. However, given their responsibility to make a separate and independent recommendation on each case, the dean may not serve as chair of the committee.

As far as possible, each department within the college should be represented on the committee. The dean may appoint up to three tenured faculty members to serve on the college committee in order to assure appropriate representation of disciplines or very large departments, participation by members of underrepresented groups, or other critical considerations to help assure fairness of the process in both fact and perception. Appointments by the dean may not constitute more than a third of the committee's total membership.

The committee may include department heads, chairs, or department-level promotion and tenure committee members. If department heads or chairs serve on college committees, their total number must be less than that of other faculty members.

The appointments of faculty members on the committee should be staggered to assure continuity from one year's deliberation to the next. If possible, members should not serve more than two successive terms (three-year terms are typical).

The college faculty representatives to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee must attend college promotion and tenure deliberations as non-voting observers but should not participate or attempt to influence college-level recommendations.

College Committee Evaluation of Candidate: The committee reviews the cases of all candidates recommended by the department committee and/or head or chair as well as cases of mandatory tenure receiving negative recommendations by both a department committee and a head or chair.

The purposes of the review are to verify that the department recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are consistent with the evidence, reflect college-wide standards, and conform to the college's expectations of the candidate's future success.

After the review, the committee votes and writes a recommendation letter for each candidate that summarizes its evaluation, including the division of the vote. If the recommendation for promotion and/or tenure varies from that received from the department committee or the department head or chair, reasons for that variance must be specified, including references to the "Expectations and Indicators" section of the relevant department's promotion and/or tenure guidelines. In the absence of a unanimous recommendation by the committee, the division of the vote must be explained. A minority letter may be attached to the committee's recommendation letter. All letters must be sent to the dean and become part of the dossier.

If the committee includes department heads, chairs, or department-level promotion and tenure committee members, none of these members may vote on cases from their departments, since each has already had an opportunity to vote or make a recommendation on those candidates. The dean does not vote on committee recommendations.

The college committee may ask the department head or chair, the candidate, and/or a representative(s) of the department committee to appear before the college committee to present additional information or clarify recommendations.

The dean may participate in committee discussions and serve in an advisory capacity to the committee to ensure compliance with college and university procedures and fair and equitable treatment of candidates. However, subsequent to the discussions with the dean, the committee must discuss the merits of the candidates, frame its recommendations, and take the final vote without the dean or other college-level personnel in attendance and without influence by the dean.

Dean's Evaluation of Candidate: The dean reviews the cases of all candidates considered by the college committee. The purpose of the dean's review is to verify that the department and college committee recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are consistent with the evidence, reflect college-wide standards, and conform to the college's expectations of the candidate's future success.

The dean writes a separate recommendation letter for every case sent to the provost. If the dean's recommendation for promotion and/or tenure varies from the college committee's, reasons for that variance must be specified, including references to the "Expectations and Indicators" section of the relevant department's promotion and/or tenure guidelines. In instances of concurrence, the dean's letter may include additional points not raised in earlier evaluations. The dean will share their letter with the committee and add it to the dossier.

For every promotion and/or tenure case (whether mandatory tenure, non-mandatory-year tenure, and/or promotion), if either the college committee's or the dean's recommendation is positive, the dossier is sent to the provost. If the college committee's recommendation is negative and the dean concurs, the dean declares a final decision and no further review is carried out.

The dossiers that the dean sends to the provost must be accompanied by a statement describing the formation and procedures of the college committee and a summary of the number of candidates considered by the committee in each category (mandatory tenure, non-mandatory-year tenure, and promotion at each rank). The division of the college committee's vote must be added to the dossier, but otherwise remains confidential.

3.4.4.3 University Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure

While the details of the procedures followed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee are maintained on the provost's website (see "Promotion and/or Tenure Procedures for University Committee Deliberations and Notifications"), those procedures are derived from the policies and standards presented below and must conform to the Faculty Handbook.

University Promotion and Tenure Committee Composition: The University Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed and chaired by the provost. The committee is composed of the

academic deans, a tenured faculty representative from each of the colleges, a tenured faculty member-at-large, and the provost. The faculty subcommittee of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee includes the college faculty representatives plus the faculty member-at-large. The provost, who is a non-voting member, chairs both the full committee and faculty subcommittee. The vice provost for faculty affairs serves as resource and scribe for committee deliberations.

Significant elements of faculty choice must be part of the selection of the faculty subcommittee; therefore, each college faculty, through means deemed suitable by them, nominates two faculty members for each vacancy, from which the provost selects one. The Faculty Senate nominates two faculty members for the at-large appointment, from which the provost selects one. The selection of the faculty members should be based on demonstrated professional excellence. The faculty members of the committee hold rotating terms of three years. Regardless of the size of the committee, the faculty must always have a majority of the potential votes.

Guidelines for submission of candidates' dossiers are available on the provost's website.

University Promotion and Tenure Committee Evaluation of Candidate: The committee reviews the qualifications of each candidate recommended for promotion and/or tenure by the college committee or the dean.

The purposes of the review are to verify that the recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are consistent with the evidence, reflect university-wide standards, and conform to the university's expectations of the candidate's future success.

The faculty sub-committee initially discusses all the cases with the provost in attendance. Committee members provide a brief summary of the cases from their college to begin the committee discussion, though they are not expected to champion or defend cases. Subsequent to the discussions with the provost, the faculty subcommittee must be given a period of time to discuss the cases in the absence of the provost and all other university-level personnel. The provost then rejoins the subcommittee and asks the faculty to rate the cases in order to identify those they would like to discuss further with the deans. Deans are informed of which cases the faculty subcommittee would like to discuss further and the particular concerns the subcommittee has in each case.

The full committee then convenes. The deans present information based on faculty subcommittee concerns. The committee then rates the cases to clarify which cases require further discussion. Deans abstain from rating the candidates in their colleges, as the dean's statement, which is included in the dossier, serves as their estimation of the case's strength. The provost shares the result of the rating, after which the full committee discusses the cases. The committee adjourns and reflects upon the group discussion.

Upon reconvening, the provost invites committee members to comment upon any case. The full committee then votes, with deans abstaining from voting on candidates from their colleges. Similarly, faculty members serving on the committee do not vote on any case on which they previously voted.

The vote must occur through secret ballot. Though the provost shares the result of the vote with the committee, committee members must keep the results confidential. The majority vote of the committee reflects either a positive or negative recommendation to the provost. A tie vote is considered a negative recommendation.

If the recommendation for promotion and/or tenure varies from that received from the department or college, reasons for that variance must be specified, including references to the “Expectations and Indicators” section of the relevant department’s promotion and/or tenure guidelines.

Whether positive or negative, the provost forwards the committee’s recommendation to the president, including the division of the vote.

Provost’s and President’s Evaluation of Candidates: The provost makes recommendations to the president, informing the committee of those recommendations. If the provost’s recommendation for promotion and/or tenure on any case varies from that received from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, reasons for that variance must be specified, including references to the “Expectations and Indicators” section of the relevant department’s promotion and/or tenure guidelines.

The president makes recommendations for promotion and/or tenure to the Board of Visitors from among those candidates reported by the provost, with the Board of Visitors being responsible for the final decision.

3.4.4.4 Candidate Notification

As a promotion and/or tenure case proceeds, the candidate must be notified in writing of the recommendations made by each committee and administrator.

Any negative recommendations, whether by a committee or administrator, must include all substantive reasons for that recommendation, including references to the “Expectations and Indicators” section of the relevant promotion and/or tenure guidelines, as well as options for appeal. While notification letters may include excerpts from committee or administrator letters, they cannot include the results of any votes, the names of external evaluators, or statements from their evaluations.

The department head or chair notifies the candidate of the department committee’s and the head’s or chair’s recommendations to the college. The dean notifies the candidate of the college committee’s and the dean’s recommendations to the provost. The provost notifies the candidate of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee’s and the provost’s recommendations to the president. Notification will take place within 10 university business days of the completion of the committee’s and administrator’s deliberations.

In cases with a negative recommendation from the provost, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, or both, the provost does not forward the case to the president until the candidate has had time to appeal.

In cases with a final positive recommendation by the president, the provost notifies the candidate in writing that their case has been recommended by the president to the board of visitors for approval. In cases with a final negative recommendation by the president, the provost notifies the appropriate dean, who informs the candidate in writing of the reasons for the decision.

3.4.5 General Guidelines for Appeals of Decisions on Reappointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure

A faculty member who is notified of a negative decision following evaluation for a term reappointment during the probationary period, for a tenured appointment, or for promotion may appeal for review of the decision under conditions and procedures specified in this section. The appellant has a right to an explanation of the reasons for the denial. An appeal must be filed in writing within 10 university business days of formal notification of the decision, which shall explain the appeal procedures.

An appeal can be based on the following claims only: department criteria established in the “Expectations and Indicators” section of the relevant department’s promotion and/or tenure guidelines were not appropriately applied; material from the dossier was unavailable to or disregarded by reviewers through no fault of the candidate; or information in the dossier was not considered in a fair and objective manner.

Additionally, faculty have the option to grieve procedural violations of the promotion and tenure process—including violations of the appeal process presented in this section—after a negative decision on an appeal or instead of filing an appeal in the first place. Since the grievance procedures allow the grievant to state both the grievance they believe they have experienced and the relief they seek, it has a wider range of possible outcomes than the appeal process. However, because it is a slower process that may not be completed until the promotion and/or tenure cases in a given year have been decided, and because faculty cannot grieve “items falling within the jurisdiction of other university policies and procedures,” a grievance should be thought of as a means for faculty to seek an outcome they cannot seek through the appeal process. The grievance process is described in chapter three, “Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures.”

Administrators and committees hearing an appeal must limit the scope of their recommendations to the grounds presented above: in particular, they must not substitute their own judgment on the merits of the case for that of the body or individual responsible for the decision under appeal. The recommendations should address the allegations in the appeal with specificity and cite appropriate evidence.

A faculty member can appeal the decision at more than one level. There is no appeal of the president’s recommendation to the Board of Visitors or the board’s final decision.

Appeals should be resolved as quickly as possible without compromising fairness or thoroughness of review. Whenever possible, the appeal should be resolved in time to accommodate the first meeting of the Board of Visitors in the fall semester.

A faculty member with questions or concerns about the appeal process or who believes that the procedures described in this section have been improperly followed may, at any point, seek advice from [the Faculty Senate Committee on Reconciliation](#).

3.4.5.1 Appeal of Probationary Reappointment Decision

Faculty members on probationary term appointments should make no presumption of reappointment. The department head or chair with the advice of the departmental personnel committee or the faculty development committee determines non-reappointment. Notice of non-reappointment is furnished according to the schedule in chapter two, “Retirement, Resignation, and Non-Reappointment.” The specific reasons for the decision are provided to the faculty member in writing.

If the decision is based primarily on evaluation of the faculty member’s performance, including perceived lack of potential for further professional development, then the faculty member may appeal the decision to the dean of the college. If the dean sustains the departmental decision, the faculty member may request, through the dean, the further and independent review of the decision by the properly constituted college committee on promotion and tenure.

The faculty member presents the appeal in writing as specified in chapter three, “Appeals of Decisions on Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion.” The faculty member has the right to appear before the committee to present arguments. The college committee makes recommendation to the dean, who informs the faculty member of the committee’s recommendation and the dean’s subsequent decision. The dean’s decision closes the appeal process, unless it varies from the college committee’s recommendation, in which case the faculty member may appeal to the provost for a final decision.

3.4.5.2 Appeal of Promotion and/or Tenure Decision

Appeal of negative department or college decisions: Because all mandatory tenure cases, even those given a negative recommendation by the department committee and the head or chair, receive a full college level review, there is no appeal of a negative tenure decision at the department level.

With all non-mandatory cases, whether promotion and/or tenure, if the committee and the relevant administrator both make negative recommendations, the candidate may appeal that negative decision to the next level in the process. The faculty member has the right to appear before the committee considering the appeal and present arguments.

If either the college committee or the dean grants the appeal of a negative department decision, the case resumes normal consideration, beginning with the college committee and dean. If either the University Promotion and Tenure Committee or the provost grants the appeal of a negative college decision, the case resumes normal consideration, beginning with the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and the provost. At either the college or university level, if the committee and the relevant administrator both make negative recommendations, the appeal is denied and no further appeal is provided.

Appeal of negative university decisions: Because all recommendations from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and the provost are forwarded to the president, candidates may appeal negative recommendations of either or both to the Faculty Review Committee. The faculty member has the right to appear before the committee to present arguments. The Faculty Review Committee investigates the case and makes a recommendation to the president.

The president's recommendation to the Board of Visitors, and the Board of Visitors' final decision, cannot be appealed.

Table of appeal options for promotion and/or tenure cases: The following table provides a summary of the progression of cases (whether promotion and tenure, tenure only, or promotion only) that receive negative recommendations from either a committee, administrator, or both, including appeal options. This table is for reference only.

Decision	Next Step
Negative recommendation by department committee and by department head or chair (all but mandatory tenure cases)	May appeal to college committee (through the dean)
Appeal granted by the college committee and/or dean	Moves to college committee and dean for normal consideration of the case
Negative recommendation by department committee and by department head or chair (mandatory tenure cases only)	Moves to college committee and dean
Negative recommendation by department committee; positive recommendation by department head or chair	Moves to college committee and dean
Positive recommendation by department committee; negative recommendation by department head or chair	Moves to college committee and dean
Negative recommendation by college committee and dean	May appeal to University Promotion and Tenure Committee (through the provost)
Appeal granted by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or provost	Moves to University Promotion and Tenure Committee and provost for normal consideration of the case
Negative recommendation by college committee; positive recommendation by dean	Moves to University Promotion and Tenure Committee and provost
Positive recommendation by college committee; negative recommendation by dean	Moves to University Promotion and Tenure Committee and provost
Negative recommendation by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or provost	May appeal to Faculty Review Committee—recommendation is advisory to the president.
Negative recommendation by president	No appeal
Negative decision by the Board of Visitors	No appeal

Deleted: If

Deleted: grants an appeal

Deleted: If

Deleted: grants an appeal

3.7.4 Valid Issues for Grievance

For this process, a grievance is defined as a complaint by a faculty member alleging a violation, misinterpretation, or incorrect application of a policy, procedure, or practice of the university that

directly affects the grievant. Some examples of valid issues for filing a grievance are: improperly or unfairly determined personnel decisions that result in an unsatisfactory annual performance evaluation; unreasonable merit adjustment or salary level; excessive teaching load/work assignments; violations of promotion and tenure procedures, including the appeal process (see appeal process in chapter three, “Appeals of Decisions on Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion”); reprisals; substantive error in the application of policy; and matters relating to academic freedom.

Deleted: substantive

Issues not open to grievance: While most faculty disputes with the university administration may be dealt with by this grievance policy, the following issues may not be made the subject of a grievance: determination of policy appropriately promulgated by the university administration or the university governance system; those items falling within the jurisdiction of other university policies and procedures (for example, complaints of unlawful discrimination or harassment, or an appeal of a promotion and/or tenure decision based on the grounds presented in chapter three, “General Guidelines for Appeals of Decisions on Reappointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure”); the contents of personnel policies, procedures, rules, regulations, ordinances, and statutes; the routine assignment of university resources (e.g., space, operating funds, parking, etc.); usual actions taken, or recommendations made, by administrators or committee members acting in an official capacity in the grievance process; termination of appointment by removal for just cause, non-reappointment, or abolition of position; or allegations of misconduct in scholarly activities.

Deleted: related to the merits

1.2.5.2 Faculty Review Committee

The functions of the Faculty Review Committee are: to provide faculty review of faculty grievances, to evaluate procedural concerns raised by faculty serving on promotion and tenure committees, and to consider appeals in the promotion and tenure or continued appointment process when the provost does not concur with a positive recommendation from the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (see chapter three, “Appeals of Decisions on Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion”) or the University Committee on Promotion and Continued Appointment (see chapter four, “Appeals of Decisions on Reappointment, Continued Appointment, or Promotion”).